

**REMARKS**

**Formal Matters**

Claims 1, 2, and 5 are currently pending in this application. All remaining claims are either withdrawn in compliance with the election requirement dated December 18, 2003, or cancelled from the application. The pending claims read on Figures 7, 8, and 9 as identified in the Response to Election of Species submitted January 20, 2004.

Applicant notes that the IDS filed May 28, 2004, was not considered with respect to the Office Action dated 28 June 2004, and kindly requests that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of Form PTO-1449 with the Office Action directed towards this 37 C.F.R. §1.114(c) Amendment.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 1: Applicant has amended claim 1 for improved clarity. The claim amendments contain no new matter and are respectfully submitted to be supported in the originally-filed specification at, e.g., Fig. 7.

The Examiner asserts that Claim 1 is unpatentable over *Sano* in view of *Matsuzaki* under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 1 requires that “one sustain electrode [13a] is provided for a pair of first and second pixel cells adjacent to each other in the column direction...wherein said one sustain electrode [13a] is positioned above alternating said row ribs [16].” (*Applicant’s* claim 1;

with reference numerals inserted referring to *Applicant's* Fig. 7<sup>1</sup>). Referring to the Examiner's Detailed Action, "*Sano* does not disclose a single sustain electrode...provided...for a first and second pixel adjacent to each other in the column direction..." (FOA page 4). Therein, the Examiner turns to *Matsuzaki* to disclose this missing element. *Matsuzaki* discloses "...discharge electrode 19 so as to extend over two cell lines..." and shows electrode 19 as being centered over alternating row ribs 11 (col. 8, lines 65-66; Fig. 6a).

Claim 1 additionally requires "...each pixel cell, individually, has one sustain-side bus electrode [13d] and one scan-side bus electrode [13e]..." (*Applicant's* claim 1; with reference numerals inserted referring to *Applicant's* Fig. 7). Further, *Applicant* claims that each sustain electrode 13a has two sustain-side bus electrodes 13d connected to it (*Applicant's* claim 1; 13d of Fig. 7). In contrast, *Matsuzaki*, discloses a single bus electrode 192 over alternating row ribs beneath and connected to discharge electrode 19 (*Matsuzaki's* Fig. 6A; col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 1). Therefore, *Matsuzaki's* bus electrode 192 fails to provide the two sustain-side bus electrodes connected to one sustain electrode claimed by *Applicant*. Additionally 62 and 192 of Fig. 6A fail to provide two bus electrodes per pixel, as expressly required by the claim.

Lastly, the claim also requires that bus (scan-side and sustain-side) electrodes are spaced from row ribs in the column direction; and bus electrodes extend laterally in the row direction

---

<sup>1</sup> These annotations are included only for the sake of brevity, and are not intended to in any way to limit the scope of the claims to the embodiment discussed.

(*Applicant's* claim 1). Addressing this difference between *Matsuzaki* and *Applicant's* claim 1, the Examiner cites to "...bus electrode 192...has branchlike members 18b on both sides, and bus electrodes 62 have branch like members on one side... (*Matsuzaki's* col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 10)." This language in *Matsuzaki* refers to Figs. 6a to 6c, which show 18b branchlike members running horizontally, branching out from 192, forming right angles with 192. These 18b branchlike members are incorporated with 18a bandlike members to form a periphery around pixels (*Matsuzaki's* Fig. 6b). Branchlike members 18b are clearly patentably distinguishable from *Applicant's* sustain-side bus electrodes, which are claimed as extending laterally in the row direction, and are clearly shown in Fig. 7 (*Applicant's* claim 1; Fig. 7).

As to *Matsuzaki's* disclosure of bandlike members 18a, these members are only shown and disclosed as part of an '18' matrix (*Matsuzaki's* Figs. 6b and 8b; col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 67). Said matrix is neither disclosed nor claimed by *Applicant*. Further, bandlike members 18a are clearly shown overlying a rib or, at least, juxtaposition a rib. (*Matsuzaki's* Figs. 6b and 8b). The position of bandlike members 18a associated with bus electrode 192 (where bus electrode 192 was connected to a discharge electrode extending into neighboring pixels) is disclosed as being desirable to *overlay* a barrier rib (see *Matsuzaki's* col. 9, lines 53-57 and 62-65).

While 18a bandlike member of bus electrode 62 is disclosed as being arranged differently, "so as to cover the opening portion of the through path" (col. 9, lines 59-61), bus electrode 62 (*Matsuzaki*) is clearly not associated with a sustain electrode overlying two adjacent pixels (*Applicant's* claim 1). *Matsuzaki* fails to disclose one sustain electrode spanning adjacent pixels

with two sustain-side bus electrodes connected to it, each sustain-side bus electrode spaced in the column direction from a row rib, one above and one below the row rib.

*Sano* discloses bus electrodes 42 spaced in the column direction from row ribs 50. However, each discharge electrode 41 is connected to only one bus electrode 42. The combined disclosure of *Sano* and *Matsuzaki* neither teaches nor suggests a single discharge (sustain) electrode for two adjoining pixels connecting to two (sustain-side) bus electrodes; wherein said two bus electrodes extend laterally, are in separate pixels and are, and are each spaced in the column direction from the row rib. This patentably distinguishable difference is illustrated in the non-limiting embodiment shown in *Applicant's* Figure 7. For failing to teach or suggest each and every element of *Applicant's* claim 1, the §103(a) rejection of *Applicant's* claim 1 over *Sano* in view of *Matsuzaki* is believed to be in order, and respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 5. If independent claim 1 is found to be patentably distinguished from *Sano* and *Matsuzaki*, then claims 2 and 5 are likewise asserted to be in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable independent claim.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114(c)  
U.S. SERIAL NO. 09/909,910

ART UNIT 2879  
Q65531

A Petition for Extension of Time with appropriate fee accompanies this document. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all additional required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Amelia F. Morani, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 52,049

**SUGHRUE MION, PLLC**  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 17, 2004